

How is the dialectical psychical perspective of the critic with reference to that phenomenon of which he appraises the aesthetic stature similar to that of the spectator who is interested in and capable of appreciating aesthetically works of art with reference to a work of art which he appreciates aesthetically? Is it necessary for the critic to appreciate aesthetically every work of art or valid performance of a work of art to which he addresses himself in a critical capacity in order to validly appraise the aesthetic stature of that phenomenon? Is it necessary for the critic to address himself more than once to a phenomenon that is described by its creator and/or promoter as being a work of art or a valid performance of a work of art in order to validly appraise the aesthetic stature of that phenomenon? [If it is what can be said of the critic's dialectical psychical perspective with reference to that phenomenon the first time he addresses himself to that phenomenon? the second time?] If it is not necessary for the critic to address himself more than once to a phenomenon that is described by its creator and/or promoter as being a work of art or a valid performance of a work of art in order to validly appraise the aesthetic stature of that phenomenon is it not nevertheless in many instances highly useful for the critic to do so? How is the dialectical psychical perspective of the critic with reference to a work of art to which he addresses himself more than once with the intention of appraising the aesthetic stature of that phenomenon different from the dialectical psychical perspective of the spectator who appreciates aesthetically the same work of art more than once? [Is it not possible that one of the primary differences is that during his second exposure so to speak to the work of art that the critic is not only conscious of his dialectical psychical perspective with reference to the work of art in question (as he probably was during first exposure) but also that his psychical distance from the phenomenon in question is more often than not greater than it was during his first exposure to that phenomenon whereas during his second exposure to the same work of art the spectator/noncritic is not in most instances conscious of his particular dialectical psychical perspective during second exposure (any more than he was in all probability during first exposure) even though he may be conscious of the fact that his psychical perspective in the second instance is (necessarily) different than it was during first exposure?]